Invertibility of spectral x-ray data with pileup–two dimension-two spectrum case

Robert E. Alvarez

arXiv:1703.07557v1 [physics.med-ph] 22 Mar 2017

***Abstract*—In the Alvarez-Macovski[1] method, the line integrals of the x-ray basis set coefficients are computed from measurements with multiple spectra. An important question is whether the data are invertible. This paper presents a proof that measurements with two spectra and a photon counting detector with pileup are invertible.**

Key Words: photon counting, dead time, pileup, spectral x-ray, dual energy, energy selective

I. Introduction

In the Alvarez-Macovski[1] method, the line integrals of the x-ray basis set coefficients are computed from measurements with multiple spectra. The introduction of photon counting detectors into medical x-ray imaging[2] gives the possibility of providing the spectral data by pulse height analysis (PHA). These detectors, however, have multiple defects[3] that affect the information they provide. In some cases, the defects have been found to produce sharply increased noise in the estimates of the line integrals at specific object attenuations[4]. The increased noise may indicate potential non-invertibility of the transformation between the spectral measurements and the line integrals. Therefore, it is important to develop mathematical descriptions of the invertibility of the transformation.

This paper is a step towards this mathematical description. It presents a proof that measurements with two spectra and a photon counting detector with pileup are invertible. An example of this would be measurements with two x-ray tube voltages. Note that the results of this paper are not applicable to two bin pulse height analysis with pileup case since the effective spectra for that case depend on the object thickness.

II. The Alvarez-Macovski method

For biological materials we can approximate the x-ray attenuation coefficient $\mu(\mathbf{r}, E)$ accurately with a two function basis set[5]

$$\mu(\mathbf{r}, E) = a_1(\mathbf{r}) f_1(E) + a_2(\mathbf{r}) f_2(E). \tag{1}$$

In this equation, $a_i(\mathbf{r})$ are the basis set coefficients and $f_i(E)$ are the basis functions, $i = 1 \dots 2$. As implied by the notation, the coefficients $a_i(\mathbf{r})$ are functions only of the position $\mathbf{r}$ within the object and the functions $f_i(E)$ depend only on the x-ray energy E. If there is a high atomic number contrast agent, we need to extend the basis set to higher dimensions.

Neglecting scatter, the expected value of the number of transmitted photons λ_k with an effective measurement spectrum $S_k(E)$ is

$$\lambda_k = \int S_k(E) e^{-\int \mu(\mathbf{r},E) d\mathbf{r}} dE \tag{2}$$

where the line integral in the exponent is on a line from the x-ray source to the detector.

Using the decomposition, Eq. 1, the line integral in Eq. 2 is

$$\int \mu(\mathbf{r}, E)\, d\mathbf{r} = A_1 f_1(E) + A_2 f_2(E). \tag{3}$$

where $A_i = \int a_i(\mathbf{r})\, d\mathbf{r},\ i = 1 \dots 2$ are the line integrals of the basis set coefficients. The A_i are summarized as the components of the A-vector, $\mathbf{A}$, and the measurements by a vector, $\mathbf{N}$, whose components are the photon counts with each effective spectrum. Since the body transmission is exponential in $\mathbf{A}$, we can approximately linearize the measurements by taking logarithms. The results is the log measurement vector $\mathbf{L} = -\log(\mathbf{N}/\mathbf{N_0})$, where $\mathbf{N_0}$ is the expected value of the measurements with no object in the beam and the division means that corresponding members of the vectors are divided.

Equations 2 define a relationship between $\mathbf{A}$ and the expected value of the measurement vector, $\mathbf{L}(\mathbf{A})$. The invertibility of this transformation is the subject of this paper.

III. Invertibility of two basis functions-two spectra without pileup

In a previous paper[6], I showed that without pileup the transformation $\mathbf{L}(\mathbf{A})$ with two spectra and a two function basis set is invertible under quite general conditions. Since I will use parts of the derivation with the pileup case, I will repeat it here.

A. Invertibility for two simple cases

Before discussing the situation in general, two simple but important cases will be discussed. The first case is two monoenergetic spectra with energies E_1 and E_2. In this case the expected value of the measurement in Eq. 2 can be linearized by taking the logarithm. The transformation can be written $\mathbf{L}(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{M}\mathbf{A}$ where $\mathbf{M}$ is a matrix with coefficients

$$\mathbf{M} = \begin{bmatrix} f_1(E_1) & f_2(E_1) \\ f_1(E_2) & f_2(E_2) \end{bmatrix}$$

aprendtech.com, ralvarez@aprendtech.com



Fig. 1. Ratio of optimal basis set functions. Since the ratio is not constant, the condition in Equation 5 is satisfied.

The transformation is invertible if the determinant of $\mathbf{M}$ is not equal to zero:

$$\begin{vmatrix} f_1(E_1) & f_2(E_1) \\ f_1(E_2) & f_2(E_2) \end{vmatrix} \neq 0 \tag{4}$$

That is if

$$\frac{f_1(E_1)}{f_2(E_1)} \neq \frac{f_1(E_2)}{f_2(E_2)} \tag{5}$$

Figure 1 shows a plot of the ratio of the basis set functions versus energy in the medical diagnostic region. Note that the ratio is monotonically increasing. Thus, the condition in equation (5) will be true if the two energies are different.

Another useful special case is when the object is known to consist of a single material with basis set coefficient vector $\mathbf{a}$. In this case, a single photon count measurement suffices to determine the material thickness. With a single material of thickness t, the $\mathbf{A}$ vector is

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{a}t$$

and the expected number of photons is a function of only t

$$\lambda(t) = \int S_1(E) exp[-\mu(E)t] dE.$$

The derivative of λ with respect to t is always negative

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\lambda\rangle' &= \tfrac{d\lambda}{dt} \\ &= -\int \mu(E) S_1(E) exp[-\mu(E)t] dE < 0. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

because the integrand is always greater than zero. Since $\lambda(t)$ is monotonically decreasing, it can be inverted to compute t.

B. Invertibility for the general case with no pileup

For the general case, the following theorem is useful (Fulks 1978[7] page 284):

> Let F be a continuously differentiable mapping defined on an open region D in E2, with range R in E2 , and lets its Jacobian be never zero in D. Suppose further that C is a simple closed curve that, together with its interior (recall the Jordan curve theorem), lies in D, and that F is one-to-one on C. Then the image T of C is a simple closed curve that, together with its interior, lies in R. Furthermore, F is one-to-one on the closed region consisting of C and its interior, so that the inverse transformation can be defined on the closed region consisting of T and its interior.

which I paraphrase as

> If the Jacobian of a continuously differentiable two dimensional mapping is nonzero throughout an open region D and if the mapping is one to one on a simple closed curve C which lies in D, then the mapping is one to one on C and its interior.

By using this theorem the following result can be established:

> If two spectra with different maximum energies and such that suitably defined average energies of the spectra transmitted through an object are not equal over a region of the $\mathbf{A}$ plane containing the points for the object, then the two measurements $\mathbf{L}$ can be used to uniquely calculate the values of $\mathbf{A}$.

In order to establish this result, the Jacobian must be shown to be nonzero throughout a region in the (A_1, A_2) plane and the transformation must be shown to be invertible on a closed simple curve in this region.

The first quadrant will be used as the region. The closed curve consists of segments along the axes and a circle joining the ends of the segments, as shown in Figure 2. This is a region of theoretical and practical importance because a basis set consisting of the attenuation coefficients of the calibration materials is usually used, Since only positive equivalent thicknesses of the calibration materials can be used, this region must contain all the measured values. .

Since $\mathbf{L}$ is the logarithm of the measurements, the components of its Jacobian are

$$\begin{aligned} J_{ij} &= \tfrac{\partial L_i}{\partial A_j} \\ &= -\tfrac{\int f_j(E) S_i(E) exp[-A_1 f_1(E) - A_2 f_2(E)] dE}{\int S_i(E) exp[-A_1 f_1(E) - A_2 f_2(E)] dE} \quad i,j = 1,2 \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Note that by defining two normalized spectra

$$\overline{S_i}(E) = \frac{S_i(E) exp[-A_1 f_1(E) - A_2 f_2(E)]}{\int S_i(E) exp[-A_1 f_1(E) - A_2 f_2(E)] dE} \quad i = 1,2 \tag{8}$$



Fig. 2. Closed contour used in proof of invertibility. The contour consists of the two axes, drawn slightly offset here to make them visible, and a quadrant of a circle to close the line segments along the axes.

the Jacobian matrix can be written as

$$\mathbf{J} = \begin{bmatrix} -<f_1>_1 & -<f_2>_1 \\ -<f_1>_2 & -<f_2>_2 \end{bmatrix} \tag{9}$$

where $<>_i$ denotes the average using the normalized spectrum $\overline{S_i}(E)$. Thus the condition for the determinant of the Jacobian not being zero is equivalent to

$$\frac{<f_1>_1}{<f_2>_1} \neq \frac{<f_1>_2}{<f_2>_2}. \tag{10}$$

This condition must be tested for individual spectra.

In order to complete the proof of invertibility, the transformation must be shown to be invertible on a closed curve in the domain. The simple cases discussed at the beginning of this section may be used for this proof.

The parts of the curve along the axes are special cases of the single material case. Each axis corresponds to different thicknesses of one of the basis materials if the attenuation coefficient of the calibration material is used as a basis function. If other basis functions are used, the coordinates can be transformed to the attenuation coefficients of real materials and the proof applies in the transformed coordinates.

The circle of large radius is an approximation of the single energy case. For large radius, there will be high attenuation. With beam hardening, the transmitted spectrum with large attenuation therefore approaches the two monoenergetic spectra case where the energies are the maximum energies in the spectra. If the maximum energies are different, we can approach the known invertible monoenergetic case arbitrarily closely by making the radius larger and larger.

IV. Expected number of photons recorded with pileup

The response time of a photon counting detector is modeled using the dead time, τ, which is defined to be the minimum time between two photons that are recorded as separate events[8]. The dead time is an abstraction that combines the contributions to the response time of all the physical effects in the detector. In this model, the detector is assumed to start in a "live" state. With the arrival of a photon, the detector enters a separate state where it does not count additional photons. The non-paralyzable model will be used where the time in the separate state is assumed to be fixed and independent of the arrival of any other photons during the dead time. There is a second model commonly used, called paralyzable, where the arrival of photons extends the time in the non-counting state. Both models give similar recorded counts at low interaction rates but give different results at high rates where the probability of multiple interactions during the dead time becomes significant. Measurements by Taguchi et al.[9] indicate that for the detectors they studied the non-paralyzable model is more accurate at higher count rates. It also leads to simpler analytical results[10].

In a previous paper[11], I used the central limit theorem of renewal processes[12] to show that, for recording times much greater than the mean inter-event time, the expected value of recorded counts with pileup approaches

$$\langle N_{rec} \rangle = \frac{\lambda}{1+\eta}. \tag{11}$$

In this equation, λ is the expected number of photons incident on the detector during the measurement time and η is the expected number of photons arriving during the dead time τ. If ρ is the average rate of photon arrivals then $\eta = \rho\tau$. If T_{rec} is the measurement time then $\rho = \lambda/T_{rec}$. Defining $b = \tau/T_{rec}$, $\eta = b\lambda$ and the expected recorded counts are

$$\langle N_{rec} \rangle = \frac{\lambda}{1+b\lambda}. \tag{12}$$

V. Invertibility of two basis functions-two spectra case with pileup

In this section I give a proof that we can invert data consisting of measurements with two x-ray spectra with a photon counting detector with pileup. An example would be making two sequential measurements of an object using an x-ray with switching the voltage. Note that this does not prove that any two spectrum measurement with pileup is invertible. For example with two bin photon counting with PHA, pileup causes the recorded spectrum to change so the assumptions of this section would not be met.

The proof is analogous to the proof for the measurements with no pileup described in the previous Sec. III. I will show the transformation is invertible on the path in the first quadrant shown in Fig. 2.

The previous proof for invertibility on the circular segment is also applicable with pileup since, for large thicknesses, the count rate is very low so the pileup parameter η is essentially equal to zero and the pileup counts are the same as those without pileup.

The remaining part of the proof is to show that the data are invertible on the paths from the origin along the coordinates axes. The equation for the expected value of the recorded number of photons with pileup is

$$\langle N_{rec} \rangle = \frac{\lambda}{1 + b\lambda}. \tag{13}$$

Differentiating this equation along the axes

$$\langle N_{rec} \rangle' = \frac{\lambda'}{1 + b\lambda} - \frac{b\left(\lambda'\right)\lambda}{\left(1 + b\lambda\right)^2}$$

where a prime denotes a derivative with respect to object thickness. Factoring the equation

$$\begin{aligned} \langle N_{rec} \rangle' &= \frac{\lambda'}{1+b\lambda}\left(1 - \frac{b\lambda}{1+b\lambda}\right) \\ &= \frac{\lambda'}{\left(1+b\lambda\right)^2} \end{aligned}. \tag{14}$$

Since the denominator is always positive and, from Eq. 6, λ' is always less than zero, the derivative of the recorded counts with respect to object thickness is never equal to zero so the transformation of the recorded counts with pileup is invertible along the coordinate axes.

This completes the proof if we can show that the Jacobian of the transformation is never zero inside the contour. This depends on the spectra but for commonly used spectra such as from x-ray tubes with different voltages, experience has shown that the transformation is invertible in the first quadrant.

VI. Discussion

The data acquisition model used is unrealistic—most systems with photon counting detectors would also use PHA. Nevertheless, it provides an example of invertibility with pileup.

As discussed in my previous paper[11], due to the exponential probability distribution of x-ray photon interarrival times, pulse pileup is a fundamental effect. It will always be present in photon counting systems no matter how small the response time. Pileup has accurate analytical models and its analysis may lead to an understanding of invertibility with the other detector defects such as charge trapping and sharing, polarization, and incomplete photon energy deposition due to Compton scattering and K radiation escape[3].

VII. Conclusion

A proof is given of the invertibility of two dimension basis set line integrals from two spectrum, photon counting data with pileup.

References

[1] R. E. Alvarez and A. Macovski, "Energy-selective reconstructions in X-ray computerized tomography," *Phys. Med. Biol.* **21**, 733–44, (1976). [Online]. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/0031-9155/21/5/002

[2] K. Taguchi and J. S. Iwanczyk, "Vision 20/20: Single photon counting x-ray detectors in medical imaging," *Med. Phys.* **40**, 100901, (2013). [Online]. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1118/1.4820371

[3] M. Overdick, C. Baumer, K. J. Engel, J. Fink, C. Herrmann, H. Kruger, M. Simon, R. Steadman, and G. Zeitler, "Towards direct conversion detectors for medical imaging with X-rays," *IEEE Trans. Nucl. Sci.* **NSS08**, 1527–1535, (2008). [Online]. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/NSSMIC.2008.4775117

[4] R. Alvarez, "Non-invertibility of spectral x-ray photon counting data with pileup," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.04993*," (2017). [Online]. Available: https://arxiv.org/pdf/1702.04993

[5] R. E. Alvarez, "Dimensionality and noise in energy selective x-ray imaging," *Med. Phys.* **40**, no. 11, 111909, (2013). [Online]. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1118/1.4824057

[6] R. E. Alvarez, "Energy dependent information in x-ray imaging—part 1 the vector space description," *Stanford University Information Systems Laboratory-unpublished*," (1982). [Online]. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.19355.46887

[7] W. Fulks, *Advanced Calculus: An Introduction to Analysis*, 3rd ed., Wiley, 1978.

[8] G. F. Knoll, *Radiation Detection and Measurement*, 3rd ed., Hoboken, N.J.: Wiley, 2000.

[9] K. Taguchi, M. Zhang, E. C. Frey, X. Wang, J. S. Iwanczyk, E. Nygard, N. E. Hartsough, B. M. W. Tsui, and W. C. Barber, "Modeling the performance of a photon counting x-ray detector for CT: energy response and pulse pileup effects," *Med. Phys.* **38**, 1089–1102, (2011). [Online]. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1118/1.3539602

[10] D. F. Yu and J. A. Fessler, "Mean and variance of single photon counting with deadtime," *Phys. Med. Biol.* **45**, 2043–2056, (2000). [Online]. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/0031-9155/45/7/324

[11] R. E. Alvarez, "Signal to noise ratio of energy selective x-ray photon counting systems with pileup," *Med. Phys.* **41**, no. 11, 111909, (2014). [Online]. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1118/1.4898102

[12] S. M. Ross, *Stochastic Processes*, 2nd ed., New York: Wiley, 1995.